5 APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT IMPACT ANALYSIS

CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SECTIONS

Environmental analyses of the resource areas of concern are found in Chapters 6 through 17 of this EA/EIR. These chapters describe the existing affected environment, the potential for the proposed project (Alternative A) and the project alternatives (Alternatives B through D) to significantly affect the environment, and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts. Chapter 18 contains a discussion of the cumulative impacts of project implementation considered together with other development that may compound impacts. The issues evaluated in Chapters 6 through 17 include all environmental topics originally identified for review in the NOP for the EA/EIR except for those issues for which no impact would occur or those impacts that were adequately addressed in the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist and the Placer County Environmental Impact Assessment Questionnaire. Appendix A contains the NOP and the scoping comments received. Chapters 6 through 17 of this EA/EIR are each organized into the following major subsections:

Affected Environment: This section presents the existing regional and local environmental conditions, in accordance with Chapter 5 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances and Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Affected environment discussions focus on information relevant to the issue under evaluation. The area evaluated (the study area) differs by resource topic, guided by locations where impacts would be expected. For example, traffic impacts resulting from the proposed project are assessed for the regional roadway network, whereas cultural resource impacts from the proposed project are assessed for the project site only.

Regulatory Setting: This section presents the applicable regulatory framework and planning document context under which the proposed project would be implemented.

Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation Measures: This section presents criteria of significance and discusses potentially significant effects of Alternatives A through D on the existing environment, including the environment beyond the project boundaries. Specific guidance relative to criteria of significance is available from TRPA and CEQA, and is cited where appropriate.

Project impacts are numbered sequentially for Alternatives A through D in each chapter. For example, impacts in Chapter 6 for Alternative A (Proposed Project) are numbered 6.A-1, 6.A-2, 6.A-3, and so on, and impacts in Chapter 6 for Alternative B (Reduced Development) are numbered 6.B-1, 6.B-2, 6.B-3, and so on. A brief impact statement precedes the discussion of each impact and provides a summary of each impact and its level of significance. The discussion that follows includes the substantial evidence on which conclusions are made.

This section provides mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects of the proposed project to the extent feasible. The mitigation measures are numbered to correspond with the impact being addressed. For example, Impact 6.A-1 would be mitigated with Mitigation Measure 6.A-1. Unless noted otherwise, the mitigation measures presented are recommended by the EA/EIR for the consideration of TRPA and Placer County to adopt as conditions of approval. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), this section also describes whether mitigation measures would reduce project impacts to a less-than-significant level and identifies any significant unavoidable impacts.

5.2 ANALYSIS OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The four Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Development Project alternatives, Alternatives A through D, are analyzed at an equal level of detail in Chapters 6 through 17. Impacts,

and associated mitigation measures, if necessary, are identified for each alternative in each of the resource sections. Because all development alternatives would be located on the same site and would include similar elements and features, many impacts and mitigation measures would be the same or similar. Therefore, the analysis focuses on the *differences* between alternatives. Rather than repeat impact discussions for each the four alternatives, in instances where impacts would be the same, the reader is referred back to the impact discussion for Alternative A.